DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 176 TM 830 205

TITLE	Evaluating Special Education: A Study to Pilot Techniques Using Existing Data in Skokie School District 68.
INSTITUTION	Skokie School District 68, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Jan 83
GRANT	G008100428
NOTE	96p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Problems; *Elementary Education; Handicap Identification; *Individualized Education Programs; Learning Disabilities; Parent Participation; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Special Education
IDENTIFIERS	*Skokie School District 68 IL

ABSTRACT

The kindergarten through eighth grade Skokie School District 68 contains approximately 1,450 students with 15 percent served in special education classes. District 68 provides services to learning disabled, behavior disordered, and low functioning children through a comprehensive program of special education which includes identification and evaluation, multidisciplinary staffing, intense parent involvement, and special education and related services in the least restrictive setting. Three data collection instruments were developed to assess the special education services. An Individualized Education Program (IEP) checklist (Appendix A) was developed to assess the quality of IEPs. A data collection record sheet (Appendix B) was written to collect information concerning the type and amount of service, student goals and progress in achieving those goals, standardized test scores, and birth dates. An interview schedule (Appendix C) was developed to examine the perceptions of special education staff regarding the IEP process, particular instructional strategies, and the interaction between regular and special education teachers and students. Discussed are the methodology of the instruments, as well as the objective-by-objective results and practical implications. The results suggest that Skokie District 68 special education programs are operating effectively and are generally beneficial to handicapped students. (Author/PN)

EVALUATING SPECIAL EDUCATION: A Study to Pilot Techniques Using Existing Data in Skokie School District 68

January, 1983

Jack Joseph, Project Coordinator
Judith Lindgren, Project Administrator
Skokie School District 68

Stephanie Creamer, Assistant Projects Director
Dr. Kathy Lane, Project Director
Educational Testing Service

Funded under U. S. Department of Education
Grant Number G008100428
Under authority of CFDA 84,023J to:

Skokie School District 68
9300 North Kenton Avenue
Skokie, Illinois 60076

Table Of Contents

Table Of Contents (cont.)

Page

Acknowledgements

Many people worked on this project. Without all of their helpful advice and dedicated service, completing the task would not have been possible. Appreciation is extended to

Lynne Pierson who assisted District 68 staff in developing the grant proposal,

Dr. S. Kandaswany who suggested questions to study and possible methodology strategies,

Dr. James Fritts, Assistant Superintendent, Dr. John Lovetere, Associate Superintendent, and Dr. Paul Rodgers, Superintendent of District 68, who offered helpful advice throughout the project,

Gary Auslander, Carrie Axotis, Dorothy Dean, Evelyn Lewin, and Mimi Higgins, District 68 Special Education staff, who spent many hours studying records and gathering data,

and all of the other District 68 Special Education teachers for giving their time to be interviewed.

Further, District 68 is to be commended for continuing its long tradition of vigorous self assessment.

District 68 Special Education Program Description

Skokie School District 68 is located in Niles Township of Cook County, Illinois, approximately fourteen miles north of Chicago's "Loop." The District contains the northern one-third of the Village of Skokie (1980 U.S. Census, 60,278) and a small portion of the Village of Morton Grove. The District is bordered by the City of Evanston, to the east, and by the Villages of Glenview and Wilmette, to the north.

School District 68 is predominately residential but with some commercial activity. Student population numbers approximately 1450 with minority students (Asians, Hispanics, Blacks) numbering roughly 25%. Special attention has always been given to assure that the District's growing number of minority students receive equal educational opportunities, including access to special educational services.

The District consists of three K-5 schools and one 6-8 building. The staff is experienced with a significant number (80%) haveing earned a master's degree or higher.

15% of District 68 students are served in special education classes. While a member of the Niles Township Department of Special Education, a 10 district township special education cooperative, District 68 provides services to essentially all of its own learning disabled, behavior disordered and low functioning children within the District as well as a number of students from other cooperative districts.

It is now almost 17 years since the District became among the first in Illinois and the nation to develop learning disabilities programs and 12 years since the District developed specialized resource and classroom programs for behavior disordered and developmentally delayed children. At this point in time, the District provides a comprehensive program of special education which includes identification and evaluation, multidisciplinary staffing, intense parent involvement and a full range of special education and related services in the least restrictive setting.

Presently the District operates two levels of services in the elementary schools for learning disabled, developmentally disabled and behavior disordered (emotionally disturbed) students - resource services wherein the student spends the majority of the school day in the regular classroom, and self-contained classes where the student spends most of his/her time in the special education classroom. At the junior high level, all categories of students receive special education instructional and related services to varying degrees in accord with each child's individualized educational program. Severely emotionally disturbed pupils are served in a therapeutic township day school - one of the first of its kind not only in Illinois but in the nation.

In addition to these special education programs, District 68 provides extensive related services which include speech and language therapy, social work and psychological services and intervention, parent counseling and other necessary therapies.

History Of Project Including Rationale And Objective Development

During the past 17 years, District 68 has learned much about the characteristics of handicapped children, the educational approaches which appear to work with them, and the measurement of student growth. Since the passage of PL 94-142, the District has formalized the development, implementation, and revision of each child's Individualized Education Program (IEP).

Each school district has an obligation of accountability to its local board of education and the larger bodies that fund its operations. Reliable data that has been gathered from existing school records, then analyzed and interpreted, will give parents, school personnel, and the board of education the information they all require and deserve to assure the effectiveness of special education programs.

Since the IEP is the most important process and document in providing a free and appropriate public education for a handicapped child, it becomes essential that certain issues are addressed, using the IEP as a research focus.

It was, therefore, proposed that existing IEPs and other supporting data within the district be examined to address specific concerns. These concerns initally evolved around three areas:

1. Did the IEP process serve as a vehicle of communication between parents and school staff which led to the timely development of an IEP document?
2. Were the IEPs used as "management tools" to oversee each child's program and as monitoring devices to determine if each child is receiving the agreed upon education?
3. Were the IEPs used to evaluate or measure the child's growth toward meeting projected outcomes?

It was assumed that all of these issues could be studied through the careful scrutiny of existing school records, particularly written documentation surrounding the development and implementation of the Individualized Education Program.

The three areas of concern were then expanded into seven specific objectives which in each case dealt with various aspects of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) process. At this point, District 68 and Educational Testing Service staffs met numerous times over a period of several months with the goal of carefully scrutinizing the project objectives in order to determine whether each was appropriate, needed to be modified, or was inappropriate and, therefore, required deletion. Additional objectives were also proposed and studied during this period of time as well as the instrumentation that would be needed to assess each objective. It became clear as this process unfolded that the development of approriate objectives was the most important and possibly most difficult aspect of the study. Objectives were modified, deleted, or rejected for a variety of reasons which included: inclusion would expand the project beyond its original scope, sample groups too small, methodology needed to objectively measure an area could not be developed, data was unavailable or inconsistently provided in the records. This last area became extremely problematic in that a lack of uniformity and continuity in testing and IEP completion practices seemed to have a most restrictive effect in developing appropriate objectives. Of course, this problem was due in part

to almost yearly IEP form format changes between 1977 and 1981, and district testing requirements which varied for certain grades. The project staff was also very interested in extablishing objectives which could directly reflect on the effectiveness of special education services and/or programs. In addition to some of the aforementioned difficulties, the greatest barrier that seemed to exist in accomplishing this feat involved the inability to appropriate a valid control group of students. However, a few of the final objectives do indirectly shed some light on this issue. Eight project objectives were eventually derived and assessed and are listed as follows:

1. To examine the level of service provided for each prioritized goal of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to determine if:
   a. service is provided for each goal
   b. the amount of service relates to goal accomplishment
2. To measure the quality of IEPs by using a team of readers to study a random sampling of IEP documents to rate each according to a desired standard.
3. To examine the formative evaluation measures used by special education staff to assess student progress to determine what methods are perceived as most useful.
4. To examine student gain scores/goal progress to see if there is a relationship between gain/goal progress and type of services and involvement:
   a. one-on-one vs. group lessons
   b. academic vs. behavioral approach
   c. use of published vs. teacher-made materials
   d. positive parental involvement vs. negative involvement
   e. any parental involvement vs. no parental involvement
   f. resource program vs. self-contained
   g. self-contained for academics vs. mainstreaming for academics
5. To determine the percentage of special education children with birthdays between September 1 and December 1.
6. To examine the perceptions of special education teachers regarding the IEP process.
7. To examine special education teachers perceptions of interaction between special education and regular teachers and students.
8. To examine whether academic goal accomplishment is reflected in gain scores.

Methodology

Three data collection instruments were developed to address the objectives of this study. An IEP checklist (Appendix A) was developed to assess the quality of IEPs (Objective 2). A data collection record sheet (Appendix B) was written to collect information about type and amount of service, about student goals and progress in achieving those goals, about standardized test scores, and abouth birth dates (Objectives 1,4, 5 and 8). Finally, an interview schedule was developed to examine the perceptions of special education staff regarding the IEP process, particular instructional strategies, the interaction between regular and special education teachers and students (Objectives 3, 4, 6 and 7). The interview schedule is contained in Appendix C.

IEP Checklist

An IEP is a written educational plan, including both behavioral and instructional objectives for each child who receives special education services. There are content and process mandates for an IEP. By law, an IEP must include present educational status, annual goals and short-term instructional objectives, and specific educational services to be provided for each child receiving special education services. The law further states that each local educational agency provide assurances that it will establish or revise an IEP for each child receiving special education services at the beginning of each school year and will then review and, if appropriate, revise the provisions of such a program periodically but not less than annually. By law, the IEPs are to be jointly developed by the local educational agency, the teacher, the parents, and the child, whenever appropriate. The law intends that all parties will be involved throughout the process of establishment, review and revision of the IEP.

The IEP, therefore, serves as documentation for instructional services and as proof such services were provided. The content of IEPs, the process by which they were wqritten and their review and revision are an esential part of any special education program.

An IEP Checklist was developed to determine if the IEPs contained the required information. The first standard in its development was to assure that federal and state required provisions were reflected for content and process in the IEPs. An instrument was developed, piloted, and then modified by ETS and selected Skokie staff. From a possible 197 1981-82 IEPs, a random sample of 40 was chosen for examination. The district coordinator for instructional and support services then examined the 40 IEPs and completed the checklist for each. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for each item on the IEP Checklist.

Data Collection Record Sheet

A five-page data collection record sheet was written to collect information about each of the 197 students who received special education services in 1981-82. To complete the Record Sheet (Appendix B), data collectors used both the special education file and cumulative file for each student. Data collectors used these files to record information about test scores for the past three years, the type and amount of service for the past three years, the special education goals, progress toward those goals for the last two years, and critical dates.

The data collection record sheet was revised several times so that it reflected the complexity of the programs and objectives of the study. It was piloted by a special education staff member and revised again so that it

would be as clear as possible.

Five special education teachers from the four buildings in the district were the data collectors. They were responsible for gathering and coding the files of all students receiving special education services in their respective buildings and then completing the record sheets using the files. They attended a one-half day training session conducted by Skokie and ETS staffs. At the training session, the use of the data collection record sheet was demonstrated using one student's file as an example. The teachers then all used another student's file and completed the record sheet. The results and the process were then discussed and questions were answered. Thus, the data collectors reached a consensus about various procedures and interpretations. Each data collector then completed another sample record sheet which was reviewed by the trainers for accuracy. Each data collector then spent about three days completing the record sheets for their assigned 40 students who were enrolled in a building other than the one which the data collector represented.

Data for the Data Collection Record Sheet (Appendix B) were analyzed as follows:

Section A:

> Percentile scores were converted to NCEs and an NCE gain was computed for each student on each subtest that was available for three test administrations. Mean gain scores were then calculated for various groups.

Section B:

> Frequencies and percentages were calculated for type of service, including the number of students who were mainstreamed. Mean minutes per week of special education service was also calculated.

Section C:

Teachers wrote out the special education goals found in the files for the past two years. They then indicated perceived goal progress on a scale from one to five. One was defined as "no progress" and five was defined as "goal achieved." Mean goal progress was calculated for each student and for various groups.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test for significant differences between groups.

Interview Schedule

An interview schedule (Appendix C) was written to supplement the information gathered from students' files. The first part of the interview schedule consisted of 26 open and close-ended items about the IEP process, instructional approaches, coordination with "regular" teachers and students, and parental involvement. The second part of the schedule consisted of five items which requested teacher's perceptions about particular students.

All of the 21 special education teachers in the district were asked to participate in an interview during late June and July of 1982. Two of the teachers were out of town and unavailable. Thus, the district psychologist was able to interview 19 of the teachers; the average interview length was 21 minutes.

After the data collection record checklist was completed for all students, 36 students were selected for follow-up, and teachers were asked questions about these students. Students were selected if they were "high" or "low" on the measure for perceived goal progress and/or "high" or "low" on the measure for gain. The criteria for selection was as follows:

1 Students were rated "high" if they:

(a) had a mean goal progress score of at least 4 out of a possible 5 in any one of two years, and/or

(b) had a gain score of 10 or greater between any two test administrations

2. Students were rated as "low" if they:

(a) had a mean goal progress score of less than 2 out of a possible 5 in any one of two years, and/or

(b) had a gain score of 1 or less between any two test administrations

Using these criteria a total of 37 students were selected as "high" achieving and 38 students were selected as "low" achieving. Some teachers had taught up to as many as 13 of these students during the previous year; other teachers had taught none or one of these students. In order to keep the length of the interviews fairly equitable between teachers, it was decided to ask no teacher about more than three randomly selected students from their list. In this way the pool of high and low achieving students was reduced to 16 and 20, respectively.

Teacher responses to the general questions in the interview were analyzed by means of frequency and percentage breakdowns. Their responses about individual students were cross tabulated with other information about the student contained in the data collection record sheet.

Limitations

As with any research effort of this type, there are limitations to be kept in mind as you review the results. These limitations involve the nature of the special education field, testing and data collection procedures.

Special education projects are frequently evaluated by assessing administrator, teacher, or parent satisfaction with procedures and services. While we assessed teacher satisfaction with the IEP process, we also wanted to pilot some techniques new to the special education field. Specifically,

the use of gain scores on standardized achievement tests is an innovative method to assess the progress of special education students.

Because the law prohibits denying service to special education students, it is impossible to form a suitable control group to conduct experimental studies. By using standardized achievement tests, we substituted the national sample on which the tests were standardized or "normed" for the more ideal situation of using a control group for comparative purposes. Because of this limitation, only descriptive statistics are used. We were not trying to prove causation in this study. We only describe tentative relationships between variables. The reader should not infer that one condition might cause an increase in student achievement, for example. The results of this study should be viewed as tentative and could form the basis for more rigorous and sustained examinations in the future.

There were also some limitations involved with testing. Because we used already existing test scores, we did not have the complete information that would be most desirable for a study of this type. The following limitations were observed in testing procedures.

1) The test used in the district (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, Forms S & T) is administered district-wide to only those students in the third through seventh grades. We did not have comparable test scores for the other grades.

2) We did not collect information about how closely the content of the tests matched the academic content of special education classes.

There is also another limitation to using gain scores with relatively small groups of students. Every test contains measurement error. The larger the group, the more confidence one can have in the group gains. The

group gains reported in this study usually involve from 10 to 20 students. The measurement error for 10 students is approximately 5.3; for 20 students it is about 3.7. Therefore, gain scores should be interpreted according to the following example:

Example

Twenty students in the Elementary Science Program took the test in the fall of 1979 and in the fall of 1980. As a group, they showed a gain of 10 between the two administrations.

Since there is error associated with this gain of 10, the actual gain could be slightly higher or lower than 10.

For 20 students the error rate is 3.7.

So the actual gain is 10, plus or minus 3.7 as shown below.

$$10 + 3.7 = 13.7$$
$$10 - 3.7 = 6.3$$

The actual gain falls in a range from 6.3 to 13.7

The reader should keep in mind that the smaller the group of students, the less confidence one can have in the results.

A final limitation to this study involves data collection procedures. The staff completing the IEP checklist, the data record checklist, and the interviews were trained in procedures for using each of the instruments. However, they were not dispassionate outsiders, and they may have introduced bias as they collected the data. Furthermore, all of the instruments required the data collectors to make judgments. The data collection record sheet was particularly suspectible to high inference judgments. In Section C of the data collection record sheet, the data collectors were asked to use available records and notations to make a judgment about to what degree a particular goal was accomplished. Since we did not formally assess inter-rater reliability, it is possible that the raters applied somewhat different criteria as they made these judgments.

Results

Results of the study, organized by research objectives, are presented in this chapter. Descriptive statistics are presented in the tables and in the narrative to provide a clearer picture of the special education program in Skokie District 68.

Objective 1: To examine the level of service provided for each prioritized goal of the IEP to determine if a) service is provided for each goal and b) the amount of service relates to goal accomplishment.

This objective was addressed by collecting information contained in student files about the type of program they were enrolled in, the minutes per week of service, test scores, and perceptions about goal progress.

Amount of Service

Table 1 describes the amount of service in the five programs for a three year period. The average minutes per week of service remained approximately the same during a three year period in three of the programs. Average minutes per week of service increased from 1080 minutes to 1427 minutes in the Elementary BD/LI class and increased from 998 to 1318 in the Elementary Developmental class from 1979 to the 1981-82 school year. Numbers of students served during that time were relatively stable with the exception of the Elementary Resource program, where 18 students were added.

Table 2 presents this information by school. Students for each program were assigned to one of three groups of approximately equal size with the students having the lowest minutes of service forming the "low" group, with the students having the middle minutes of service forming the "middle" group, and the students receiving the highest minutes of service forming the "high" group. Different patterns of service are seen in the Elementary

Objective 1

Table 1

AMOUNT OF SERVICE IN THE FIVE SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

PROGRAM	1979-80 N	1979-80 Range of Minutes/ Week	1979-80 Average Minutes Per Week	1980-81 N	1980-81 Range of Minutes/ Week	1980-81 Average Minutes Per Week	1981-82 N	1981-82 Range of Minutes/ Week	1981-82 Average Minutes Per Week
Elementary Resource	38	60-480	254	46	30-490	228	56	30-635	294
Elementary Developmental	14	360-1380	998	18	440-1490	971	20	750-1570	1318
Elementary BD/LI Class	21	500-1420	1080	13	840-1500	1200	21	500-1670	1427
Junior High Resource	17	200-400	271	37	160-600	296	53	180-600	275
Junior High Self-Contained*	7	600-1000	714	14	600-1000	786	24	120-1200	793

*only students who were 6th graders in 1979-80 are included

Table 2

PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF SERVICE BY PROGRAM AND SCHOOL
N = ( )

Program	Devonshire	Stenson	Highland	Old Orchard
Elem Resource M/Week				
Low (30-150 Min)	-	11.1 (2)	58.3 (14)	-
Med (160-290 Min)	33.3 (4)	16.7 (3)	37.5 (9)	-
High (300-635 Min)	66.7 (8)	72.2 (13)	4.2 (1)	-
Elem Developmental M/Week				
Low (360-960 Min)	-	-	20.0 (1)	-
Med (980-1360 Min)	42.9 (6)	-	40.0 (2)	-
High (1360-1570 Min)	57.1 (8)	-	40.0 (2)	-
Elem BD/LI M/Week				
Low (500-1140 Min)	-	16.7 (1)	88.9 (8)	-
Med (1170-1300 Min)	-	83.3 (5)	11.1 (1)	-
High (1320-1500 Min)	100% (3)	-	-	
Junior High Resource M/Week				
Low (160-200 Min)	-	-	-	66.0 (35)
Med (400 Min)	-	-	-	30.2 (16)
High (600 Min)	-	-	-	3.8 (2)
Junior High-Self Contained M/Week				
Low (120-600 Min)	-	-	-	33.3 (8)
Med (800-999 Min)	-	-	-	29.2 (7)
High (1000-1200 Min)	-	-	-	37.5 (9)

Resource Programs and the Elementary BD/LI class. In the resource program at Devonshire and Stenson, more students receive 300 to 635 minutes per week of service than at Highland where 58.3 percent of the students receive 30 to 150 minutes per week of service. The BD/LI classes at Stenson and Highland also differ; almost 90 percent of the Highland students receive less than 1140 minutes per week of service, while at Stenson 83 percent receive 1170 to 1300 minutes per week.

Amount of Service and Goal Accomplishment

The relationship between minutes per week of service and perceived goal progress and gain on tests is shown on Tables 3 and 4 respectively. "Low", "Middle" and "High" categories were formed by combining these same categories from the five programs. "Mean goal progress" was determined for each of the seven areas indicated on the IEP. Based on available information in students' files, the data collectors assigned a rating from 1 (no progress) to 5 (goal achieved) to goals written for each child. An average was calculated for each goal and for all goals for every student.

Table 3 shows that perceived goal progress was essentially the same regardless of the minutes of service received by students each week.

"Mean gain scores" (Table 4) were calculated by converting a student's percentile rank on each subtest and on the total battery into another metric called the Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE). The NCE scores represent equal units ranking from 1 to 99 that can be added, subtracted, and averaged. Students' scores from the first administration of a test were subtracted from the scores on the second administration and the result is a "mean gain score".

Objective 1

Table 3

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS BY MINUTES PER WEEK OF SERVICE

N = ( )

GOAL AREAS	LOW MINUTES PER WEEK		MEDIUM MINUTES PER WEEK		HIGH MINUTES PER WEEK	
	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82
Reading	3.40 (14)	3.23 (11)	3.64 (21)	3.51 (23)	3.27 (24)	3.26 (26)
Mathematics	3.24 (11)	3.22 (9)	2.97 (19)	3.57 (19)	3.41 (14)	3.37 (28)
Spelling /Language	2.17 (16)	3.39 (22)	2.93 (17)	3.59 (22)	2.63 (12)	2.55 (22)
Physical Education	2.40 (5)		3.00 (2)	5.00 (1)	3.00 (3)	3.50 (2)
Work Habits	2.78 (27)	2.88 (30)	2.74 (26)	2.96 (27)	2.75 (16)	2.04 (21)
Self Help/Vocation	2.00 (3)	3.00 (1)	3.25 (4)	4.00 (2)	4.33 (3)	3.00 (2)
Social/Emotional	2.87 (31)	3.06 (29)	2.91 (27)	3.21 (28)	2.75 (22)	2.65 (31)
TOTAL	2.90 (45)	3.11 (59)	3.07 (38)	3.25 (46)	3.08 (30)	2.92 (45)

Example

Adam received a 35th percentile in reading when he took the standardized test in the fall of 1979. He received a 50th percentile in reading when he took a similar version of the test again in the fall of 1980.

50th percentile = 50 NCE
35th percentile = - 42 NCE
7 NCE gain

From the example above, you can see that Adam had a gain of 7.

Any gain above a zero (0) shows that the student is learning more than the national sample of students on which the test was standardized.

Table 4 shows the mean NCE gain for students in the "low", "middle", and "high" minutes per week categories. There were significant differences in gain scores during the 1979-80 school year depending on the group. The most dramatic example is the 1979-80 math gain. Students receiving more service showed significantly higher math gains than those who received less service. During 1980-81, students who received more service also gained more than those who received less service, but this difference is not statistically significant, and it could have occurred by chance. Nevertheless, most of the comparisons showed that the more service students received, the higher the gains on standardized achievement tests.

Objective 2: To measure the quality of IEPs by using a team of readers to study a random sampling of IEP documents to rate each according to a desired standard.

Forty randomly selected IEPs were examined using an IEP checklist as described previously. Information about the evaluation of goal statements was also collected on the data collection record sheet.

Objective 1

Table 4

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY MINUTES/WEEK OF SERVICE
N = ( )

TESTS	MINUTES PER WEEK OF SERVICE					
	LOW		MEDIUM		HIGH	
	1979-80	1980-81	1979-80	1980-81	1979-80	1980-81
TOTAL READING	.78 (27)	1.18 (17)	6.75 (16)	1.50 (20)	3.76 (7)	6.29 (21)
TOTAL LANGUAGE	-.59* (27)	-.96 (17)	9.21* (16)	-.15 (20)	2.90* (7)	7.52 (21)
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	2.27* (27)	3.24 (17)	6.75* (17)	1.10 (21)	18.60* (5)	4.95 (21)
TOTAL BATTERY	1.15* (27)	1.41 (17)	7.50* (16)	1.65 (20)	8.20* (5)	5.70 (20)

* Significant differences between groups $p<.05$

The IEP Process

Approximately 83 percent of the IEPs had been reviewed within the last calendar year. One IEP had a review but the review was not dated. The review is often a separate set of documents called an 'Annual Review'. It is probable that among the fourteen percent not reviewed, there were many first year IEPs. (That is, the child's first year in special education in which case an Annual Review would not be appropriate.)

The IEP is to be written by a multi-disciplinary team which must include a representative of the local school district who is qualified to provide or supervise special education, the child's teacher, evaluation personnel, parent or guardian, and, when appropriate, the child. These categories are not always mutually exclusive. For example, the school principal could be both the local school representative and the evaluation staff member. It is not mandatory that the regular classroom teacher be present. The IEP Checklist asked if the following people were represented at the meeting: special education staff person, regular teacher, parent or guardian, and evaluation staff member. In all but one case a special education staff member was present. In slightly more than half of the cases, the regular classroom teacher was present. In all but one case the parent or guardian was present and in 25 percent of the cases an evaluation staff member, exclusive of the other listed personnel categories, was present. In addition, a principal was present at eight conferences, a student at five and an outside psychologist at one conference.

Content of the IEPs

The content areas of present levels of performance, degree of participation in regular classes and student placement were almost without exception

contained on the randomly selected IEPs. All of the IEPs examined stated the child's present level of academic performance, and all but three stated the child's level of behavioral performance. Two IEPs did not state the degree of participation in regular classes. This is probably because the child was placed in a self-contained class and therefore did not participate in regular classes.

The IEP is to have a statement of annual goals. Annual goals are educational milestones to be worked toward during the year. Of the examined IEPs, 88 percent contained annual goals. Slightly more than eight percent of the IEPs had goals for the teacher rather than for the student. These goals were, therefore, not counted among the IEPs that had goal statements.

Short term instructional objectives (STOs) must also be included in an IEP. STOs are measurable instructional or behavioral steps between present levels of educational performance and the annual goals. The STOs should be related to the annual goals, should be logically and cumulatively sequenced and should be measurable. About half of the examined IEPs contained such STOs. In all but two of these cases the STOs were related to the goal, in all but one case the STOs were measurable and in 80 percent of these cases the STOs were logically and cumulatively sequenced. In 13 percent of the cases, the STOs were not related to one another. In many of the remaining cases, there were either no STOs or the STOs were too broadly stated to be measured.

Evaluation of IEP Goals

Evaluation procedures must also be included on the IEP. Evidence that the evaluation was done should appear on the Annual Review. The IEP Checklist asked if the 40 IEPs included evaluation measures for each STO.

Repeatable evaluation measures appeared in about half of the examined IEPs, and in all but one case the evaluation had been done. In about half of the sampled IEPs repeatable evaluation measures did not appear. In about 30 percent of these cases teacher observation was listed an evaluation measure; in some cases only "periodic evaluation" was listed, and in at least one case the child was new to the district. Another apparent problem was some confusion between evaluation with methodology. An example is using a workbook drill as an evaluation.

An examination of goal statements and their evaluation was also conducted with all of the 197 special education students and results are shown on Table 5. In Skokie District 68, approximately 1000 goal statements are written each year or approximately five per child. In 1980-81, there was no record of 31 percent of these goals being evaluated; in the subsequent year, there was no record of 34 percent of these goals being evaluated. There is more likely to be a record of evaluations of reading goals than of goals in other areas.

Objective 3: To examine the formative evaluation measures used by special education staff to assess student progress to determine what methods are perceived as most useful.

During the interviews with the special education teachers, the interviewer asked questions about how teachers assessed their students as the year progressed. Table 6 shows that all of the teachers use systematic observation and 74 percent ranked that method first. Twelve (63 percent) ranked student products as the formative evaluation measure they used second most. Skills checklists and tests and quizzes ranked third and fourth, respectively.

Table 5

NUMBER AND EVALUATION OF GOAL STATEMENTS
1980-81, 1981-82
N = 197

GOAL AREAS	NUMBER OF GOAL STATEMENTS 1980-81	NUMBER OF GOAL STATEMENTS 1981-82	NUMBER OF GOALS THAT WERE NOT EVALUATED 1980-81	NUMBER OF GOALS THAT WERE NOT EVALUATED 1981-82	PERCENT NOT EVALUATED 1980-81	PERCENT NOT EVALUATED 1981-82
Reading	169	168	34	41	20%	24%
Mathematics	161	176	42	55	26%	31%
Spelling/Language	146	156	48	60	33%	38%
Physical Education	23	6	9	2	39%	33%
Work Habits	189	220	57	84	30%	38%
Self Help/Vocational	36	14	17	4	47%	29%
Social/Emotional	257	307	94	110	37%	36%
TOTAL	981	1047	301	356	31%	34%

Objective 3

Table 6

RANK ORDER OF TEACHER USE OF FORMATIVE EVALUATION MEASURES
N=19

FORMATIVE EVALUATION MEASURES	1st	2nd	3rd	4th	5th	6th
Skills Checklist		1	6	5	6	1
Tests & Quizzes	1		9	7	1	1
Text Mastery Test			1	5	10	2
Systematic Teacher Observation	14	5				
Student Products	3	12	2	2		
Other	1	1	1		2	1

The interviewer also asked teachers about formative evaluation measures they used with specific pre-selected students. These students were selected because they ranked either"high" or "low" on a combination of perceived goal progress and/or gain scores. Teachers were unaware if the students they were asked about were designated as being "high" or "low". Table 7 shows the percentage of high and low students who were evaluated using various measures. Teachers are slightly more likely to use textbook tests and student products with low achieving students and more likely to use systematic observation with high achieving students.

Finally, the interviewer asked teachers about sources of information they used to make initial judgments of students. Teachers were asked to select five sources of information from a list of 11 choices. Table 8 shows the six most important sources of information.

It appears that teachers depend on both written and informal information received from teachers and parents when they make their initial judgments about students.

Objective 4: To examine student gain scores/goal progress to see if there is a relationship between gain/goal progress and type of services and involvement:

a. one-on-one vs. group lessons
b. academic vs. behavioral approach
c. use of published vs. teacher-made materials
d. positive parental involvement vs. negative involvement
e. any parental involvement vs.no parental involvement
f. resource program vs. self-contained
g. self-contained for academics vs. mainstreaming for academics

---

Two measures were used to assess student achievement in this study: perceived goal progress and gain scores. As described earlier, data collectors assigned a rating from 1 (no progress) to 5 (goal achieved) to goals

Objective 3

Table 7

DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS BY TEACHER'S USE OF FORMATIVE EVALUATION MEASURES

FORMATIVE EVALUATION MEASURES	HIGH STUDENTS N=15	LOW STUDENTS N=17
Skills Checklist	-	-
Test & Quizzes	-	-
Textbook Tests	6.7%	11.8%
Systematic Observation	73.3%	52.9%
Student Products	20.0%	35.3%
Other	-	-

Table 8

SOURCES OF INFORMATION USED BY TEACHERS TO MAKE INITIAL STUDENT JUDGMENTS
N = 19

SOURCES OF INFORMATION	N	Percent
Written reports from previous regular and/or special education teachers	19	100%
Informal information from other special education staff	16	89%
Past IEPs, when available	14	74%
Personal observations	12	63%
Informal information from parents	10	53%
Informal information from past regular teachers	10	53%

written for each child. An average was calculated for each goal and for all goals for every student. In 1981-82, the mean goal progress for 162 students in all goal areas was 3.03 or "Some Progress".

Mean gain scores were also derived for those students who took the district standardized tests at least twice. A gain higher than 0 indicates that students are learning more than the students on which the test was standardized. Compensatory education programs (Title I) typically show a yearly gain of 2 to 3 NCEs. The mean gain for all students taking the tests are as follows:

Mean Gain Between Fall of 1979 and Fall of 1980 n = 68	3.97
Mean Gain Between Fall of 1980 and Fall of 1981 n = 80	2.31
Mean Gain Between Fall of 1979 and Fall of 1981 (2 years) n = 44	7.34

Before examining the specific subpoints of this objective, descriptive data about the perceived goal progress and gain scores of special education students will be presented by program, grade, and sex. This will provide a context to better understand the subsequent sections.

Achievement of Students by Program, Grade, and Sex

Table 9 shows the perceived progress made toward academic and non-academic goals by students in the five special education programs. With two exceptions (1980-81 Junior High Resource and Junior High Self-Contained), the data indicate that teachers see more goal progress in academic areas such as reading and math than they do in non-academic areas such as social/emotional during a one year period. In 1981-82, mean goal progress in

Table 9

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM
N = ( )

TYPE OF PROGRAM	ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1980-81	ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1981-82	NON-ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1980-81	NON-ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1981-82
Elementary Resource	3.07 (46)	2.95 (46)	2.62 (47)	2.69 (54)
Elementary Developmental	3.77 (18)	3.64 (21)	3.12 (20)	2.67 (18)
Elementary BD/LI Class	3.46 (15)	3.31 (13)	2.98 (16)	3.00 (22)
Junior High Resource	2.76 (12)	3.89 (14)	2.94 (27)	3.19 (32)
Junior High Self-Contained	3.06 (9)	3.15 (17)	3.26 (9)	2.90 (16)
TOTAL	3.21 (100)	3.27 (111)	2.87 (100)	2.87 (142)

academic areas was 3.27 out of a possible 5.00; mean goal progress in non-academic areas was 2.87 out of a possible 5.00.

Tables 10 and 11 show the gain scores of students who were enrolled in the five special education programs and who took standardized tests at least twice. From this table you can see that not all special education students took standardized tests. Approximately 66 percent of the special education students took the tests in the fall of 1979 and again in the fall of 1980. Approximately 60 percent took the tests in the fall of 1980 and again in the fall of 1981. Only 40 percent of the students took the tests at all three administrations. However, the data indicate that, with one exception (1979-80 Junior High Self-Contained), all students showed gains on the Total Battery, regardless of the program in which they were enrolled.

Perceived goal progress and gain scores for students enrolled in different grades was also examined and data are shown in Table 12. First graders showed the most goal progress in academic areas, while fourth graders showed the least during two successive years. Fourth graders also showed the least progress in non-academic areas. In 1980-81 first graders showed the most progress in non-academic areas, and in 1981-82, kindergarteners showed the most progress.

Table 13 shows gain scores for students enrolled in the third through sixth grades during 1979. With the exception of sixth graders, the gains are comparable across grades.

Perceived goal progress and gain scores of females and males are shown in Tables 14 and 15. There are approximately twice as many males as females enrolled in special education. Table 14 shows that there is very little difference between females and males in perceived goal progress, and

Table 10

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY TYPE OF PROGRAM RECEIVED IN 1979-80

N = ( )

TYPE OF PROGRAM	TOTAL READING		TOTAL LANGUAGE		TOTAL MATHEMATICS		TOTAL BATTERY	
	Fall 1979-Fall 1980	Fall 1979-Fall 1981	Fall 1979-Fall 1980	Fall 1979-Fall 1981	Fall 1979-Fall 1980	Fall 1979-Fall 1981	Fall 1979-Fall 1980	Fall 1979-Fall 1981
ELEMENTARY RESOURCE Total Possible N = 38	3.57 (28)	7.70 (27)	7.51 28	10.16 (27)	13.17 (27)	13.14 (26)	8.67 (27)	10.58 (26)
ELEMENTARY DEVELOPMENTAL Total Possible N = 14	-4.50 (2)	12.00 (2)	14.00 (2)	16.50 (2)	1.15 (2)	3.77 (3)	8.00 (2)	16.50 (2)
ELEMENTARY BD/LI CLASS Total Possible N = 21	7.57 (11)	10.39 (11)	1.48 (11)	4.39 (11)	5.82 (11)	12.55 (11)	5.90 (10)	7.60 (10)
JUNIOR HIGH RESOURCE Total Possible N = 17	1.25 (16)		1.19 (16)		2.69 (16)		1.69 (16)	
JUNIOR HIGH SELF-CONTAINED Total Possible N = 7	-2.29 (7)		-2.00 (7)		.81 (7)		1.86 (7)	
TOTAL	2.79 (64)	8.66 (40)	4.06 (64)	8.89 (40)	7.47 (63)	12.27 (40)	5.21 (62)	10.11 (38)

Table 11

MEAN GAIN SCORES BETWEEN FALL 1980 AND FALL 1981 BY TYPE OF PROGRAM RECEIVED IN 1980-81

N = ( )

TYPE OF PROGRAM	TOTAL READING	TOTAL LANGUAGE	TOTAL MATHEMATICS	TOTAL BATTERY
ELEMENTARY RESOURCE	4.26	3.00	2.00	3.02
Total Possible N = 46	(43)	(43)	(42)	(42)
ELEMENTARY DEVELOPMENT CLASS	0	-2.00	3.00	6.00
Total Possible N = 18	(1)	(1)	(2)	(1)
ELEMENTARY BD/LI CLASS	-2.00	-6.02	5.62	0
Total Possible N = 13	(13)	(13)	(13)	(13)
JUNIOR HIGH RESOURCE	2.29	4.86	2.47	3.71
Total Possible N = 37	(14)	(14)	(15)	(14)
JUNIOR HIGH SELF-CONTAINED	10.80	3.00	-.40	2.40
Total Possible N = 14	(5)	(5)	(5)	(5)
TOTAL	3.20	1.73	2.58	2.63
	(76)	(76)	(77)	(75)

Table 12

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS BY GRADE IN 1980
N = ( )

GRADE	ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1980-81	ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1981-82	NON-ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1980-81	NON-ACADEMIC PROGRESS 1981-82
K	3.58 (4)	3.31 (6)	2.58 (4)	3.79 (7)
1	3.72 (6)	3.93 (10)	3.33 (7)	3.60 (10)
2	3.77 (14)	3.10 (15)	2.85 (14)	2.97 (17)
3	3.45 (19)	2.97 (19)	2.67 (21)	2.30 (26)
4	2.51 (18)	2.89 (20)	2.55 (22)	2.23 (24)
5	3.36 (19)	3.72 (14)	3.08 (15)	3.08 (20)
6	3.19 (10)	3.50 (7)	3.09 (15)	3.35 (17)
7	2.62 (11)	3.21 (13)	2.89 (22)	2.79 (14)
TOTAL	3.22 (101)	3.27 (104)	2.85 (120)	2.87 (135)

Table 13

MEAN GAIN SCORES FOR GRADES 3 THROUGH 6 (STUDENTS' GRADE IN 1979)
N = ( )

TESTS	GRADE 3			GRADE 4			GRADE 5			GRADE 6		
	Fall 79 To Fall 80	Fall 80 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 80	Fall 80 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 80	Fall 80 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 80	Fall 80 To Fall 81	Fall 79 To Fall 81
TOTAL READING	1.73 (21)	3.72 (25)	5.40 (21)	5.07 (14)	3.70 (20)	8.29 (14)	6.06 (16)	5.10 (21)	10.94 (16)	0 (24)		
TOTAL LANGUAGE	2.63 (21)	3.56 (25)	8.63 (21)	6.81 (14)	-2.05 (20)	2.45 (14)	4.38 (16)	4.19 (21)	7.25 (16)	.42 (24)		
TOTAL MATHEMATICS	11.72 (19)	5.36 (25)	17.19 (19)	6.57 (14)	.40 (20)	4.40 (15)	4.90 (17)	2.87 (22)	3.84 (17)	2.15 (24)		
TOTAL BATTERY	5.84 (19)	3.92 (25)	8.79 (19)	6.14 (14)	2.35 (20)	6.93 (14)	6.06 (16)	4.10 (21)	8.50 (16)	.71 (24)		

Table 14

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS OF FEMALES AND MALES
1980-81 and 1981-82
N = ( )

GOALS	Female		Male	
	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82
Reading	3.38 (20)	3.13 (19)	3.49 (47)	3.23 (50)
Mathematics	3.25 (18)	3.17 (20)	3.40 (33)	3.50 (38)
Spelling/Language	2.66 (14)	3.10 (21)	2.54 (39)	3.12 (48)
Physical Education	2.67 (3)	2.00 (1)	2.75 (8)	3.00 (2)
Work Habits	2.79 (30)	2.57 (33)	2.74 (53)	2.67 (53)
Vocational/Self Help	3.40 (5)	3.50 (4)	3.09 (11)	1.75 (4)
Social/Emotional	2.99 (25)	3.26 (29)	2.70 (66)	2.76 (70)
TOTAL	3.04 (45)	3.13 (54)	2.93 (86)	2.98 (108)

Table 15

MEAN GAIN SCORES OF FEMALES AND MALES
N = ( )

	Females			Males		
TESTS	Fall 1979 to Fall 1980	Fall 1980 to Fall 1981	Fall 1979 to Fall 1981	Fall 1979 to Fall 1980	Fall 1980 to Fall 1981	Fall 1979 to Fall 1981
Total Reading	3.35 (24)	2.77 (26)	9.38 (14)	2.33 (46)	2.35 (55)	6.59 (32)
Total Language	4.38 (24)	2.62 (26)	11.57 (14)	1.49 (46)	.80 (55)	2.86 (32)
Total Math	5.23 (23)	1.04 (27)	10.95 (13)	6.53 (45)	3.33 (54)	7.63 (32)
Total Battery	4.17 (23)	2.65 (26)	9.87 (13)	3.87 (45)	2.15 (54)	6.29 (31)

with one exception the same is true for gain scores as shown in Table 15. Females do show appreciably greater gains on the language subtest than do males, especially in the three test administrations from fall of 1979 to the fall of 1981.

One-to-One vs. Group Lessons

One goal of the study was to see if there was any difference in perceived goal progress between those students who received a lot of time on a one-to-one basis with the teacher and those who did not have as much one-to-one time.

Teachers were asked what percentage of their time was spent on a one-to-one basis with selected high and low achieving students. Table 16 shows that the percentage of time spent on a one-to-one basis had no relationship to perceived goal progress in either academic or non-academic areas. Table 17 shows that a student's level of achievement does not appear to affect how much time a teacher spends on a one-to-one basis with students.

Academic Approach vs. Behavioral Approach

The interviewer also asked teachers what type of approach they used with these same selected high and low achieving students. Table 18 indicates that use of an academic approach may be associated with greater perceived goal progress, especially in the Social/Emotional area. Table 19 indicates that teachers may have a tendency to use more of an academic approach with high achieving students.

During the interview, all teachers were also asked about what approach they used in general with their students. An academic approach was defined as "drill, reinforcement of concepts, and mastery of subject matter." A behavioral approach was defined as "helping students adjust socially, giving

Objective 4a

Table 16

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS OF SELECTED STUDENTS IN 1981-82 BY TIME ON ONE-TO-ONE BASIS AS REPORTED BY 1981-82 TEACHER

GOAL AREA	PERCENT OF TIME ON ONE-TO-ONE			
	0-10%	15-25%	30-50%	70-100%
Reading	4.75 (4)	2.75 (4)	4.17 (3)	3.50 (2)
Mathematics	4.05 (4)	4.00 (2)	4.00 (1)	4.00 (4)
Spelling/Language	4.17 (6)	2.60 (5)	5.00 (2)	2.67 (3)
Work Habits	2.50 (4)	3.13 (4)	2.17 (4)	2.17 (6)
Self Help/Vocation	5.00 (1)	-	-	2.00 (1)
Social/Emotional	2.76 (7)	2.75 (4)	3.31 (8)	2.29 (7)
TOTAL	3.27 (11)	3.10 (7)	3.19 (11)	2.61 (9)

Table 17

DISTRIBUTION PERCENTAGE OF SELECTED HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS BY TIME ON A ONE-TO-ONE BASIS WITH THEIR 1981-82 TEACHER

TIME ON ONE-TO-ONE BASIS	HIGH STUDENTS N = 16	LOW STUDENTS N = 15
0-10%	25%	27%
15-25%	19%	27%
30-50%	31%	20%
70-100%	25%	27%

Objective 4b

Table 18

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS OF SELECTED STUDENTS IN 1981-82 BY TEACHING APPROACH AS REPORTED BY 1981-82 TEACHER
N = ( )

GOALS	100% ACADEMIC	75% ACADEMIC 25% BEHAVIORAL	50% ACADEMIC 50% BEHAVIORAL	75% BEHAVIORAL 25% ACADEMIC	100% BEHAVIORAL
Reading	5.00 (1)	4.25 (4)	3.67 (3)	3.00 (3)	-
Mathematics	-	4.00 (3)	4.40 (3)	3.75 (4)	-
Spelling /Language	4.67 (3)	4.00 (5)	2.50 (4)	3.00 (4)	-
Work Habits	3.00 (1)	3.00 (4)	2.50 (3)	2.83 (6)	1.17 (4)
Self Help/Vocation	-	-	5.00 (1)	2.00 (1)	-
Social/Emotional	5.00 (2)	3.33 (3)	2.79 (7)	2.10 (8)	1.63 (4)
TOTAL	4.44 (3)	3.90 (8)	2.85 (9)	2.66 (10)	1.42 (5)

Objective 4b

Table 19

DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS BY THEIR TEACHER'S INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH

INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACH	HIGH STUDENTS N=15	LOW STUDENTS N=18
100% ACADEMIC	20%	0
75% ACADEMIC 25% BEHAVIORAL	20%	22.2%
50% ACADEMIC 50% BEHAVIORAL	13.3%	27.8%
75% BEHAVIORAL 25% ACAEDEMIC	33.3%	33.3%
100% BEHAVIORAL	13.3%	16.7%

students feedback about behavior, helping students get along with teachers." The results to this question are shown in Table 20.

Table 20

TEACHERS' APPROACH

	N = 19
100% Academic	0
75% Academic 25% Behavioral	1
50% Academic 50% Behavioral	13
75% Behavioral 25% Academic	5
100% Behavioral	0

Skokie teachers appear to favor a blend of the academic and behavioral approach when working with their students.

Published vs Teacher Made Materials

In the interview, the special education teachers were asked about their use of materials in general, and then about their use of materials with specific selected high and low achieving students.

In general, teachers prefer to use a combination of published and teacher made materials as shown in Table 21.

Table 21

TEACHER USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS
N = 19

100% Published	0
75% Published/ 25% Teacher-Made	7
50% Published 50% Teacher-Made	12
75% Techer-Made 25% Published	0
100% Teacher-Made	0

We also looked at the relationship between perceived goal progress and the use of instructional materials with selected high and low achieving students. Perceived goal progress was slightly lower when teachers used more teacher-made materials as shown in Table 22. Table 23 shows that there is very little difference in the type of materials used with high and low achieving students.

Positive Parental Involvement vs. Negative Involvement

Perceived goal progress was also examined in relation to parental involvement. Teachers were asked to indicate the type of parental involvement of selected high and low achieving students. These ratings were then related to perceived goal progress as shown in Table 24. Table 24 indicates that perceived goal progress in academic areas is apparently unrelated to parental involvement. However, in non-academic areas, there are significant differences in goal progress between those parents who were rated as positive and those who were rated as negative or reluctant.

Table 25 shows that a greater percentage of high achieving students have parents who were rated as providing positive, supportive involvement. Parental involvement may be associated with high achieving students, especially in the non-academic areas.

Resource Program vs. Self-Contained and Self Contained Academics vs. Mainstreaming for Academics

Special education students can be placed in resource programs with under 400 minutes per week of service or they can be placed in self-contained classrooms and receive approximately 400 to 1600 minutes per week of special education service. The amount of service received when a student is in a self-contained classroom varies, and many students are "mainstreamed" into regular classrooms for academic subjects even though their primary type

Objective 4c

Table 22

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS OF SELECTED STUDENTS IN 1981-82
BY TYPE OF MATERIAL AS REPORTED BY 1981-82 TEACHER
N = ( )

GOALS	100% PUBLISHED	75% PUBLISHED 25% TEACHER MADE	50% PUBLISHED 50% TEACHER MADE	75% TEACHER-MADE 25% PUBLISHED	100% TEACHER-MADE
Reading		4.33 (3)	4.29 (7)	2.25 (2)	2.00 (1)
Mathematics	3.50 (2)	4.67 (3)	4.55 (4)	3.00 (1)	3.00 (1)
Spelling /Language	4.50 (2)	3.67 (6)	3.50 (6)	1.00 (1)	3.00 (1)
Work Habits	2.75 (2)	2.41 (9)	3.25 (4)	1.00 (2)	2.00 (1)
Self Help/Vocation	-	-	5.00 (1)	2.00 (1)	-
Social/Emotional	4.00 (2)	2.65 (9)	3.28 (9)	2.10 (5)	1.00 (1)
TOTAL	3.78 (3)	2.99 (17)	3.82 (10)	2.00 (7)	2.00 (1)

Objective 4c

Table 23

DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS BY THEIR TEACHER'S USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

TYPE OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL	HIGH STUDENTS N=16	LOW STUDENTS N=18
100% Published	12.5%	5.6%
75% Published/ 25% Teacher-Made	37.5%	50.0%
50% Published/ 50% Teacher-Made	37.5%	16.7%
75% Teacher-Made/ 25% Published	12.5%	22.2%
100% Teacher-made	0	5.6%

Objective 4d, e

Table 24

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS OF SELECTED STUDENTS IN 1981-82
BY TYPE OF PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT AS REPORTED BY 1981-82 TEACHER
N = ( )

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	ACADEMIC GOALS	NON-ACADEMIC GOALS*
A lot of positive, supportive involvement	3.92 (8)	3.68 (12)
Some positive, supportive involvement	3.75 (6)	2.08 (7)
Required involvement only, neither positive nor negative	4.08 (4)	2.89 (6)
A little negative, unsupportive involvement	-	1.75 (2)
Reluctant involvement, not present when expected	3.76 (3)	1.63 (5)
TOTAL	3.88 (21)	2.74 (32)

*Differences Between Pareng Groups are Significant at the .06 level

of service is in a self-contained classroom.

First, we wanted to examine the possible relationships between perceived goal progress and type of service received. Table 25 shows that there is very little difference in perceived goal progress between those students enrolled in the resource program and those in self-contained classrooms, although the self-contained students were perceived to have made slightly greater goal progress. Similarly, Table 25 also shows very little difference in perceived goal progress between those students who were and those who were not mainstreamed. The data indicates that type of service has very little relation to perceived goal progress.

This same issue is examined in Tables 26 and 27, only here we look at gain scores in relation to type of service for two separate years. Table 26 shows that between the fall of 1979 and the fall of 1980 students in the resource program had slightly better gains than those who were not, with the exception of the Reading Subtest. However, those self-contained students who were not mainstreamed did somewhat better than those who were mainstreamed. Table 27 shows a similar pattern for the school year 1980-1981 and for the two year period from 1979 to 1981.

Objective 5: To determine the percentage of special education students with birthdays between September 1 and December 31.

A continuing issue of the Skokie staff is the entrance date of children with birthdays from September 1 to December 1. It was a common perception that children who are youngest in the class may be referred in disproportionate numbers for special education services, possibly because of the potential

Objective 4d, e

Table 25

DISTRIBUTION OF SELECTED HIGH AND LOW ACHIEVING STUDENTS BY PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT RATINGS

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT RATINGS	HIGH STUDENTS N=15	LOW STUDENTS N=18
A lot of positive, supportive involvement	53.3%	27.8%
Some positive, supportive involvement	13.3%	27.8%
Required involement only, neigher positive nor negative	13.3%	22.2%
A little negative, unsupportive involvement	6.7%	5.6%
Reluctant involvement, not present when expected	13.3%	16.7%

Table 25

MEAN GOAL PROGRESS BY TYPE OF SERVICE

N = ( )

TYPE OF SERVICE	READING		MATHEMATICS		SPELLING/ LANGUAGE		PHYSICAL EDUCATION		WORK HABITS		SELF HELP VOCATION		SOCIAL EMOTIONAL		TOTAL	
	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82	1980-81	1981-82
Elementary & Junior High Resource	3.26 (38)	2.97 (37)	2.78 (24)	2.98 (24)	2.57 (34)	3.05 (41)	2.50 (4)	3.25 (4)	2.73 (57)	2.63 (60)	2.89 (9)	1.60 (5)	2.76 (58)	2.96 (51)	2.86 (85)	3.03 (98)
Elementary Developmental Class																
Elementary BD/LI Class	3.73 (31)	3.52 (31)	3.75 (28)	3.67 (35)	2.80 (22)	3.21 (31)	2.86 (7)	-	3.01 (28)	2.64 (29)	3.57 (7)	4.33 (3)	2.90 (36)	2.91 (52)	3.27 (51)	3.12 (68)
Junior High Self-Contained																
Mainstreamed	3.89 (8)	4.15 (3)	3.93 (7)	2.50 (2)	3.33 (10)	4.00 (2)	2.67 (3)	-	3.40 (5)	4.00 (3)	-	5.00 (1)	3.46 (7)	2.30 (5)	3.55 (11)	2.88 (5)
Not Mainstreamed	3.14 (16)	3.23 (11)	3.17 (15)	3.39 (12)	2.97 (7)	2.70 (10)	3.67 (3)	2.00 (1)	3.31 (13)	2.00 (12)	3.80 (5)	1.00 (1)	3.04 (16)	2.72 (17)	3.28 (24)	2.70 (26)

Objective 4f, g

Table 26

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY TYPE OF SERVICE RECEIVED IN 1979-80

N = ( )

TYPE OF SERVICE	TOTAL READING		TOTAL LANGUAGE		TOTAL MATHEMATICS		TOTAL BATTERY	
	1979-1980	1979-1981	1979-1980	1979-1981	1979-1980	1979-1981	1979-1980	1979-1981
Elementary & Junior High Resource	2.73 (44)	7.70 (27)	5.21 (44)	10.16 (27)	9.27 (43)	13.14 (26)	6.07 (43)	10.57 (26)
Elementary Developmental Class								
Elementary BD/LI Class	2.92 (20)	10.64 (13)	1.52 (20)	6.25 (13)	3.60 (20)	10.66 (14)	3.26 (19)	9.08 (12)
Junior High Self-Contained								
Mainstreamed	3.90 (10)	7.20 (10)	3.03 (10)	3.43 (10)	4.03 (11)	11.69 (12)	5.70 (10)	9.50 (10)
Not Mainstreamed	11.77 (3)	22.10 (3)	4.67 (3)	15.67 (3)	11.00 (2)	4.50 (2)	9.00 (2)	7.00 (2)

Objective 4f, g

Table 27

MEAN GAIN SCORES BY TYPE OF SERVICE RECEIVED IN 1980-81

N -= ( )

TYPE OF SERVICE	TOTAL READING		TOTAL LANGUAGE		TOTAL MATHEMATICS		TOTAL BATTERY	
	1980-81	1979-81	1980-81	1979-81	1980-81	1979-81	1980-81	1979-81
Elementary & Junior High Resource	3.77 (57)	10.42 (34)	3.46 (57)	9.86 (34)	2.12 (57)	11.47 (33)	3.20 (56)	10.00 (32)
Elementary Developmental Class								
Elementary BD/LI Class	1.47 (19)	5.09 (11)	-3.44 (19)	5.12 (11)	3.85 (20)	7.52 (12)	.95 (19)	8.36 (11)
Junior High Self-Contained								
Mainstreamed	-2.75 (8)	1.00 (5)	-8.04 (8)	-2.74 (5)	5.22 (9)	11.33 (6)	-.75 (8)	6.40 (5)
Not Mainstreamed	8.08 (12)	16.66 (8)	5.75 (12)	11.88 (8)	4.77 (13)	10.16 (8)	6.08 (12)	11.00 (7)

for their being more immature than their peers. As a part of this study, birth dates were recorded and percentages calculated for both special education and regular students. The results are presented in Table 28 which shows no difference between the two groups.

Table 28

PERCENTAGES OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REGULAR STUDENTS' WITH BIRTHDAYS IN TWO TIME PERIODS

	Special Ed Students (N = 197)	Regular Students (N = 1256
Birthdays from Dec. 2 to Aug. 31	73.1%	73.8%
Birthdays from Sept. 1 to Dec. 1	26.9%	26.2%

Objective 6: To examine the perceptions of special education teachers regarding the IEP process.

The interviewer asked the special education teachers 16 open and close-ended questions about their perceptions of the IEP process. These questions focused on the usefulness and worth of the IEP, input from regular classroom teachers, and paren al involvement in the special education program.

Usefulness and Worth of the IEP

Constructing and reviewing an IEP and documenting both of those steps is often a time consuming process. Special education teachers are responsible in a large part for this, and we wanted to explore their reactions to the process and their suggestions for improvement. Teachers were asked to rate the usefulness of IEPs in working with their students. Three of the 19 teachers (16%) rated the IEPs as very useful in working with their students,

and nine teachers (47%) rated them as somewhat useful. Approximately 37% said that the IEPs were not very useful. The most common responses to the question about information from the IEPs the teachers have used in the past as they have worked with students were: test scores (9), goals (9), and past teacher comments and behavioral observations (8).

Nine respondents said that nothing could be added to IEPs to help them do a better job with their students. Five teachers said that a narrative report summarizing student functioning should be added to the IEP. Other responses included: more parent reactions and impact; more structured types of information; a closer delineation of strengths and weaknesses; and additional time to develop goals.

There was great variety in the responses to the question asking for suggestions for improving the record-keeping process for special education students. Five teachers had no suggestions; three teachers suggested adding a briefly written narrative; two suggested using a consistant reporting format in all schools; two said that a mechanism should be provided for changing goals from year to year; two said that less time should be spent on filling out forms; two teachers suggested regularly reviewing/organizing files. Teachers were also asked "Is the IEP best suited for some particular types of students?". Eight teachers said that the IEP is best suited for particular types of students. Three of them felt that the IEPs are best suited for learning disabled students because academic goals are easier to measure. Other responses were that IEPs are best suited for: children with mild handicapping conditions; students with physical handicaps; children who are low functioning only in certain areas; children in a self-contained

setting; and atypical handicapped students for whom normal teaching approaches do not work.

Only five teachers (26%) felt that time spent on the IEP was worth the effort. Five teachers said that qualitative information such as an ancedotal record would make the IEP a more worthwhile process and document. Two teachers said that cutting out everything except a summary in terms of goals and progress would make it more worthwhile. One teacher suggested having two types of IEPs: a detailed version for students moving into a new class and a short form for students staying in the same class. Other responses included: minimizing record keeping by eliminating short term objectives, having more time to develop the IEPs, making revisions without calling a parent conference, and making the process more of an ongoing dialogue with less required meetings so each meeting would be more meaningful.

Input from Regular Teachers

Fourteen teachers (74%) said that the IEP process provides adequate opportunity for input from most regular classroom teachers. Five teachers (25%) felt that not enough opportunity was provided. However, seven teachers said that regular teachers do not contribute much to the IEP, 11 felt they made some contributions, and only one teacher feels that regular teachers contribute a great deal to the IEP.

Parental Involvement

A legally required component of the IEP process is that a parent or guardian be present at the IEP conference. Teachers were asked four questions concerning parental involvement beyond attendance only during the IEP process. About half of the teachers perceived that the IEP process provides some opportunity for parental input; about 42 percent think the IEP process provides a great deal of opportunity for parental input; and the remaining two teachers think this process does not provide much opportunity for

parental input. Slightly more than half of the teachers who were interviewed do not think parental input is helpful in the construction of the IEP. Of the remaining respondents about half each think parental input is either somewhat helpful or very helpful.

Sixty-eight percent of the teachers interviewed remembered instances of an IEP being changed because of parental input. This 68 percent does not mean that 68 percent of the IEPs were changed because of parental input. It simply means that 68 percent of the teachers remembered an IEP being changed because of such input. It could be that one IEP out of twenty for which a particular teacher was responsible was changed because of a parental suggestion or request.

In the cases where techers remembered an IEP being changed because of parental input, they were asked if they could specifically remember such a change and to elaborate on it. Fifty-eight percent of the parent input changes were related to goals in the IEP. In some instances wording was changed or modified. In others, a specific skill was added such as learning to tell time or learning to deal with money. In one instance, a mother wanted elective subjects added to the IEP. In 25 percent of the cases, a child's placement was changed. For example, because a parent thought their child was under too much teacher pressure, the parent wante her child's placement to be changed from a resource room to a contained class. Other parent input included keeping a contained emphasis on academics in the IEP and requesting more one-to-one instruction.

Teachers are required to meet with the parents/guardians of special education students at least three times during the school year. However,

many times additional communication is necessary. In fact, 63 percent of the teachers interviewed thought more regularly scheduled time is necessary to personally communicate with parents to improve student performance. Teachers were asked what form of communication they used when they did communicate with parents beyond the three required meetings. Phone calls were used by 68 percent, 26 percent met at school; and five percent used written communication.

Objective 7: To examine special education teachers' perceptions of interaction between special education and regular teachers and students.

Many students who receive special education do so on a resource basis. That is, they receive both special education and regular classroom instruction. Therefore, during the interviews, teachers were asked about their perceptions of interaction between special education and regular teachers and students. This question was posed in a general framework, not specifically as part of the IEP process. The results are included here because they relate to the previous IEP question concerning regular/special education teacher communication.

Nine techers (47%) felt that there was a great deal of coordination between regular teachers and the special education staff when delivering services to special education students, and nine felt that there was some coordination. Only one teacher felt there was not much coordination. When asked what, if anything, could be done to improve coordination between regular and special education teachers, eight teachers felt that there should be more regularly scheduled communication between regular and

special education teachers and four teachers suggested more informal communication. Five teachers suggested that it was the responsibility of the special education staff to clarify responsibilities, make themselves available to regular staff, provide support, and consider regular teachers' ideas. Two teachers suggested joint classroom observations. Four teachers felt that nothing could be done to improve coordination. Two teachers suggested that regular teachers should be more flexible in their expectations of students and in their curriculum.

Fourteen teachers (74%) said that there is a great deal of interaction between resource special education students and regular students in school. Four teachers said there is some interaction. There seems to be considerably less interaction between special education students in self-contained classes and regular students in school; only three (16%) of the teachers felt there was a great deal of interaction and nine felt there was some interaction.

Objective 8: To examine whether academic goal accomplishment is reflected in gain scores.

In order to examine the relationship between perceived goal procress in academic areas and student performance on tests in academic areas, we did a crosstabulation of those students showing high, medium or low gains on the Reading, Mathematics and Language Subtests with students perceived to have high, medium and low goal progress in those same areas. For example, one would expect that the greatest percentage of students in the high category for gain scores would also be in the high category for goal progress. The

actual results are presented in Table 29. With few exceptions, the results are not what one would expect. There is not a close correspondence between gains as measured by standardized tests and progress as perceived by teachers' evaluations in the students' records.

Objective 8

Table 29

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOAL PROGRESS IN 1980-81
AND GAIN SCORES BETWEEN FALL OF 1980 AND
FALL OF 1981

N = ( )

GOAL PROGRESS	GAIN SCORES IN TOTAL READING		
READING	LOW (Less than 0)	MEDIUM (0-10 NCE)	HIGH (11 or more NCE)
Low (less than 2.5)	18.8 (9)	16.7 (2)	30.0 (3)
Medium (2.5 to 3.5)	29.2 (14)	41.7 (5)	20.0 (2)
High (3.51 to 5.00)	52.1 (25)	41.7 (5)	50.0 (5)

GOAL PROGRESS	GAIN SCORES IN TOTAL MATHEMATICS		
MATHEMATICS	LOW (Less than 0)	MEDIUM (0-10 NCE)	HIGH (11 or more NCE)
Low (less than 2.5)	18.9 (7)	38.5 (5)	33.3 (1)
Medium (2.5 to 3.5)	29.7 (11)	30.8 (4)	33.3 (1)
High (3.51 to 5.00)	51.4 (19)	30.8 (4)	33.3 (1)

GOAL PROGRESS	GAIN SCORES IN TOTAL LANGUAGE		
SPELLING/LANGUAGE	LOW (Less than 0)	MEDIUM (0-10 NCE)	HIGH (11 or more NCE)
Low (less than 2.5)	52.4 (22)	50.0 (5)	60.0 (3)
Medium (2.5 to 3.5)	28.6 (12)	20.0 (2)	20.0 (1)
Low (3.51 to 5.00)	19.0 (8)	30.0 (3)	20.0 (1)

Practical Implications

Despite the limitations discussed in the Methodology section, the results of the study seem to support some carefully drawn inferences which will be presented in order of each research objective.

Objective 1: To examine the level of service provided for each prioritized goal of the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to determine if: a) service is provided for each goal, and b) the amount of service relates to goal accomplishment.

It would seem apparent from Table 1 and Table 2 that the amount of service provided for each prioritized goal had generally increased over time in nearly every program. The number of students served had also slightly increased every year at the elementary levels with the greatest increase seen in the elementary resource programs. However, in the Junior High setting, it could not be determined if the number of students served had increased due to incomplete record access. (The records of students who had graduated before the 1981-82 school year were not available.)

Table 3 suggests that when data gatherers subjectively rated goal progress (after examining special education records) and compared these ratings to the amount of service that students were receiving, no relationship seemed to exist between the variables. However, as can be seen in Table 4, when goal progress was defined on a more objective basis as mean gain scores (NCE conversions) seen on consecutive standardized group achievement test administrations, the results did support the notion that more special education service (time) is associated with academic progress. This was especially evident in the 1979-80 mean gain scores where overall progress was noted as being statistically significant. The 1980-81 mean gain scores also suggested that overall progress improved when students received greater amounts of special education service time, but these scores were not statistically significant.

One might conclude from these results that objectively derived information (e.g., test

scores) may produce a clearer indication of progress than judgments made through more subjective means (e.g., perceived goal progress ratings). Of course, the mean gain score approach did not address the issue of assessing certain non-academic areas (e.g., social-emotional, behavioral concerns) and thus suffered from this limitation. Furthermore, it is reasonable to point out that goals which are highly prioritized and thus usually receive greater service, may typically be aimed at more serious problems which would also be more difficult to remediate. Thus, comparisons of effectiveness of special education intervention strictly as a function of time (amount of service) may be somewhat misleading.

Objective 2: To measure the quality of IEPs by using a team of readers to study a random sampling of IEP documents to rate each according to a desired standard.

An examination of randomly selected IEPs revealed that the process in District 68 is in general conformance with state and federal guidelines with respect to when and by whom IEPs are developed and reviewed. Similar conformance was generally noted with respect to the content of the IEPs examined. However, one area of IEP development where room for improvement could be noted was in the writing of measurable short term objectives which need to be logically related to annual goals. A collateral concern was noted in the need to increase the evaluation of goals and short term objectives, especially in non-academic areas.

Objective 3: To examine the formative evaluation measures used by special education staff to assess student progress to determine what methods are perceived as most useful.

Table 6 supports the notion that District 68 special education teachers rely quite heavily on their own systematic observations when evaluating their students' performances. However, Table 7 suggests that this reliance is greatest in cases where students are doing relatively well in class. For lower achieving students, it seems that information

gathered from student products and tests take on a greater importance. Perhaps teachers are more reluctant to make negative judgments about low achieving students without first corroborating these judgements with "back up" data.

Table 8 also suggests that the special education teaching staff rely quite heavily on written and informal reports from previous regular and special education staff when making their initial judgments about new students assigned to their class. Interestingly, this information seemed to be relied upon even more frequently than past IEPs (when available).

Objective 4: To examine student gain scores/goal progress to see if there is a relationship between gain/goal progress and type of services and involvement:

a. one-on-one vs. group lessons
b. academic vs. behavioral approach
c. use of published vs. teacher-made materials
d. positive parental involvement vs. negative involvement
e. any parental involvement vs. no parental involvement
f. resource program vs. self-contained
g. self-contained for academics vs. mainstreaming for academics

---

Tables 10 and 11 suggest rather clearly that special education students district-wide displayed considerable overall academic growth as seen on the mean gain scores that were generated. Tables 9, 12 and 14 suggest that perceived goal progress as rated by the data gatherers was seen on the whole as being consistently higher in academic as opposed to non-academic areas. This trend was seen across special education programs, grade levels and sex. Gains in each area also seemed comparable across programs, grade and gender. Similar patterns were noted when gain scores were compared (Tables 11, 13, 15) with the exception of language gains where females demonstrated greater growth than males. However, these gains could only be noted for those students who were administered standardized tests at least twice between the Fall of 1979 and the Fall of 1981. For approximately 35 per cent of the students, this criterion was not met and, therefore, no inferences could be made regarding their progress as measured by standardized tests.

a. Tables 16 and 17 suggest that the amounts of one-to-one attention that a student received from his teacher seemed to have no relationship to perceived goal progress ratings for either academic or non-academic areas. Once again, the point should be made that more serious problems are often given greater individual attention; yet, many of these problems may be more difficult to remediate. Therefore, comparisons of the effectiveness of one-to-one attention vs. group instruction should be viewed very cautiously.

b. Tables 18 and 19 addressed the issue of teaching using an academic approach vs. behavioral orientation (as defined in the Results section). In general, most of the teaching staff reported that they use some combination of the two approaches. Interestingly, a heavier academic focus seemed to be associated with greater perceived goal progress ratings, especially in the social-emotional areas. There also seemed to be a greater academic focus with higher achieving students. This may suggest that lower achieving students have greater behavioral difficulties which must be dealt with before academics can be approached. However, the question might be raised that, if one were to reap greater benefits overall from an academic teaching approach, then why reduce the potential beneficial gains of this approach in favor of another (behavioral) for needier students? Perhaps District 68 special education teachers may, in general, feel better trained and prepared to focus on an academic rather than a behavioral approach and, therefore, perceive their results as being more satisfactory when doing so. Of course, one would more comfortably and safely conclude from the data that a strong academic approach may reap greater dividends for students both academically and social-emotionally. One might further speculate that a given teaching approach might be far less important than the quality of the teacher, although this specific question was not studied. It then follows that the consistent application of any given teaching approach by competent, committed teachers who are comfortable with that approach will be successful.

c. Although the special education teaching staff in general prefers to use a combination of published and teacher-made materials for their students, perceived goal progress

seemed to be more closely associated with the use of published materials. Once again, however, this relationship should be viewed cautiously since teachers may need to use tailor-made materials for the more atypical, seriously handicapped students. Table 23 mildly supports this notion.

d.& e. Parental involvement was examined in relation to perceived goal progress and found to be unrelated to perceived academic progress but strongly related to perceived goal progress in non-academic areas (e.g., social-emotional). In addition, positve parental involvement was, in general, more closely associated with high achieving students. One could safely surmise that encouraging parental support could only be beneficial to student progress as a whole.

f.& g. Resource programs were compared to self-contained classroom settings in order to examine the possible relationship of perceived goal progress ratings to those services. The data from Table 25 suggests that little difference exists in goal progress ratings between students enrolled in either program although the ratings seemed a bit higher for self-contained students. Similarly, no difference was noted in perceived goal progress between students who were and those who were not mainstreamed. When these differences in service were examined using gains scores, resource program students manifested slightly higher gains than their self-contained counterparts. Of course, when comparing resource vs. self-contained students and mainstreamed vs. non-mainstreamed students, earlier cautions regarding the possible confounding effects of comparing groups of students wh may be vastly different with respect to the nature and degree of their handicapping conditions is in order. It is, therefore, especially interesting in lieu of this caution to note that those self-contained students who were not mainstreamed did somewhat better (obtained higher mean gain scores) than those who were mainstreamed. Since, in general, if one assumes that mainstreaming is a strong indication of pupil progress, it seems possible that this aforementioned data may suggest a need to more carefully examine District mainstreaming practices.

Objective 5: To determine the percentage of special education students with birthdays between September 1 and December 1.

There is a common perception that children who are youngest in the class may be referred in disproporionate numbers for special education services, possibly because of the potential for their being more immature than their peers. Table 28 addresses this issue by comparing the percentage of special education students who have birthdays between September 1 and December 1 with the regular students who have birthdays in the same period. Table 28 shows that there were no differences between these groups.

Objective 6: To examine the perceptions of special education teachers regarding the IEP process.

In general, the majority of special education teaching staff viewed IEPs as being mildly to moderately useful in working with their students, however a significant minority view the IEPs as not useful. Test scores and past teachers comments and observations were viewed as the most widely used information gained from previously developed ILPs There was also some feeling that the IEP form could be enhanced by the addition of a narrative report summarizing student functioning. The idea of a briefly written narrative report again surfaced when teachers were asked how the general record keeping process for special education students could be improved. In general, there seemed to be considerable dissatisfaction with various aspects of the present IEP process and format, such that the majority of the staff felt that the time spent working on the IEP was not worth the effort. However, general satisfaction was expressed that the IEP process provided adequate opportunity for input from both regular teachers and parents. Nevertheless both of these groups were perceived as contributing only marginally to the IEP document. Despite these views, more regularly scheduled time to personally communicate with parents was seen by a majority of the staff as being one way to improve student performance.

Objective 7: To examine special education teachers' perceptions of interaction between special education and regular teachers and students.

The majority of the special education staff felt that there was considerable coordination between regular teachers and the special education staff when delivering services to special education students. Nevertheless, the staff still indicated that more regularly scheduled and/or informal communication would enhance the process.

Objective 8: To examine whether academic goal accomplishment is reflected in gain scores.

In general, perceptions regarding goal accomplishment (subjectively rated) were not related to reported gain scores. One might surmise that these forms of assessing academic progress are not comparable. Furthermore, it is difficult to ascertain solely on the basis of examining Table 29 which of these two approaches provides a more reliable and valid picture of student progress.

Suggestions

As a whole, the present study strongly suggests that Skokie District 68 special education programs are operating effectively and are generally beneficial to its handicapped students. For example:

> Although there was no relationship between the number of minutes that a student received special education services and progress toward IEP goals, within the time allocations of the District there was a positive relationship between gain scores on standardized tests and the amount of special education time students received during a year.
>
> The special education students who took standardized tests made better than expected progress and was seen across all programs and grades.

Another issue which was examined and may merit further consideration include:

> Parental involvement was strongly related to perceived goal progress in non-academic areas. In addition, positive parental involvement was more closely associated with higher achieving students.

However, certain global concerns may be raised. It would seem that a future emphasis be placed upon developing and/or increasing the utilization of objectively based measures for assessing the effectiveness of special education programs. This seems especially important for non-academic goal remediation. Special education teachers are clearly signaling for this type of information in helping them to make important decisions regarding their students.

The IEP may also be in need of major revisions in order for it to become a more meaningful document and process as opposed to being a perfunctory exercise. Major areas of possible improvement for the IEP process would include the following: developing a stable form and format for its completion, developing uniformity in how it is to be utilized, uniformity in developing short-term objectives related to annual goals (which are measurable), uniformity in assuring that all goals are assessed, uniformity in developing standards for administering standardized tests where results can be reported (in the IEP) and, it's hoped, help to determine goal progress and accomplishment, encouraging IEP managers to include an addendum at the time the IEP is annually reviewed which qualitatively summarizes student functioning for the year via a brief narrative report (this would be expecially desirable if the student is slated for a new teacher the following year). With the aforementioned improvements, decisions regarding the possible mainstreaming of self-contained special education students may be enhanced. Current practices in this area may also be in need of more careful scrutiny.

It is hoped that the information gleaned from the current study will be used to modify some current practices, facilitate cooperative planning and thereby maximize the effectiveness of special education services. In addition, it may provide the structural foundation for developing more comprehensive and definitive studies in the future.

It was found that the use of IEP data, particularly goal statements, goal evaluations, test scores, and type and amount of service was a viable way of gathering descriptive data about special education services in the district.

It is suggested that the District continue to study the gain scores of special education students who take standardized tests and consider expanding the testing of special education students by using out of level testing.

6/11/82

SKOKIE DISTRICT 68
RECORD CHECKLIST

Student I.D. Number ___ ___ ___[1-3]

Present Grade ____[4]

Present School____[5]

Birthdate ___ ___/___ ___/___ ___[6-11]

Date of Entrance to District 68 ___ ___/___ ___[12-15]

Date of Referral ___ ___/___ ___[16-19]

Date of Starting Special Ed ___ ___/___ ___[20-23]

Section A - Test Scores

1. Write in student grade for each year that is available.
2. Use code sheet to indicate test level given during each year.
3. Write in percentile for each test and subtest.

YEAR	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
STUDENT GRADE:	_____ [24]	_____ [25]	_____ [26]
TEST LEVEL:	_____ [27]	_____ [28]	_____ [29]
Reading Vocabulary	_____ [30-31]	_____ [32-33]	_____ [34-35]
Reading Comprehension	_____ [36-37]	_____ [38-39]	_____ [40-41]
Total Reading	_____ [42-43]	_____ [44-45]	_____ [46-47]
Spelling	_____ [48-49]	_____ [50-51]	_____ [52-53]
Language Mechanics	_____ [54-55]	_____ [56-57]	_____ [58-59]
Language Expression	_____ [60-61]	_____ [62-63]	_____ [64-65]
Total Language	_____ [66-67]	_____ [68-69]	_____ [70-71]
Math Computation	_____ [72-73]	_____ [74-75]	_____ [76-77]
Math Concepts	_____ [78-79]	_____ [80-81]	_____ [82-83]
Math Application	_____ [84-85]	_____ [86-87]	_____ [88-89]
Total Math	_____ [90-91]	_____ [92-93]	_____ [94-95]
Total Battery	_____ [96-97]	_____ [98-99]	_____ [100-101]
Reference Skills	_____ [102-103]	_____ [104-105]	_____ [106-107]
Science	_____ [108-109]	_____ [110-111]	_____ [112-113]
Total Science	_____ [114-115]	_____ [116-117]	_____ [118-119]

Section B - Special Education Services

1. Complete student grade for each year.
2. Put a check next to appropriate class or program.
3. Complete minutes per week.
4. Use code sheet to complete teacher blank.
5. Use code sheet to complete mainstreaming information for number 2 and 3 only (if applicable).
6. Use code sheet to put a source of information code in parentheses under completed information like this: Minutes/Week 600 (2)

	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
STUDENT GRADE:	_____ [120]	_____ [121]	_____ [122]
1. Elementary LD/LD Resource Program	_____ (__) [123]	_____ (__) [124]	_____ (__) [125]
Minutes/Week	_____ (__) [126-128]	_____ (__) [129-131]	_____ (__) [132-134]
Special Ed. Teacher(s)	_____ (__) [135-138]	_____ (__) [139-142]	_____ (__) [143-146]
2. Elementary Developmental Class	_____ (__) [147]	_____ (__) [148]	_____ (__) [149]
Minutes/Week	_____ (__) [150-152]	_____ (__) [153-155]	_____ (__) [156-158]
Special Ed. Teacher(s)	_____ (__) [159-162]	_____ (__) [163-166]	_____ (__) [167-170]
Mainstreamed classes (include academic only)	_____ (__) [171-175]	_____ (__) [176-180]	_____ (__) [181-185]
3. Elementary BD/Learning Improvement Class	_____ (__) [186]	_____ (__) [187]	_____ (__) [188]
Minutes/Week	_____ (__) [189-191]	_____ (__) [192-194]	_____ (__) [195-197]
Special Ed. Teacher(s)	_____ (__) [198-201]	_____ (__) [202-205]	_____ (__) [206-209]
Mainstreamed classes (include academic only)	_____ (__) [210-214]	_____ (__) [215-219]	_____ (__) [220-224]
4. Junior High LI/Developmental/ BD Resource (less than 3 periods)	_____ (__) [225]	_____ (__) [226]	_____ (__) [227]
Minutes/Week	_____ (__) [228-230]	_____ (__) [231-233]	_____ (__) [234-236]
Special Ed. Teacher(s)	_____ (__) [237-240]	_____ (__) [241-244]	_____ (__) [245-248]
5. Junior High Self Contained (more than 3 periods)	_____ (__) [249]	_____ (__) [250]	_____ (__) [251]
Minutes/Week	_____ (__) [252-254]	_____ (__) [255-257]	_____ (__) [258-260]
Special Ed. Teacher(s)	_____ (__) [261-264]	_____ (__) [265-268]	_____ (__) [269-272]
Special Education Services	_____ [273]	_____ [274]	_____ [275]

Section C - IEP Goals

1. Complete student grade
2. Write out each goal in space provided (copy from IEP)
3. Using information in the files, circle number corresponding to progress or achievement.

No Progress	Little Progress	Some Progress	Substantial Progress	Goal Achieved	No Mention
1	2	3	4	5	(0)

SCHOOL YEAR 1980-81 STUDENT GRADE _____ (276)

Reading:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(277)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(278)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(279)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(280)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(281)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(282)
Math:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(283)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(284)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(285)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(286)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(287)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(288)
Spelling/ Language:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(289)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(290)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(291)
PE:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(292)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(293)
Work Habits:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(294)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(295)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(296)
Self Help/ Vocation:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(297)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(298)
Social/ Emotional:	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(299)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(300)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(301)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(302)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(303)
	_____	1	2	3	4	5	(0) (___)	(304)

SCHOOL YEAR 1981-82 STUDENT GRADE _____ (305)

Reading:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(306)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(307)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(308)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(309)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(310)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(311)
Math:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(312)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(313)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(314)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(315)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(316)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(317)
Spelling/ Language:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(318)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(319)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(320)
PE:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(321)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(322)
Work Habits:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(323)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(324)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(325)
Self Help/ Vocation:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(326)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(327)
Social/ Emotional:	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(328)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(329)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(330)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(331)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(332)
	1 2 3 4 5	(0) (___)	(333)

SKOKIE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

RESPONDENT:_____ [1-2] DATE:_____

Time Interview Started:_____

SUGGESTED INTRODUCTION: We have been given a grant to study the special education program here in District 68. The purpose of this study is to gather information about our program. We are interviewing all the special education teachers so their reflections will be included in the overall information.

I will be asking you questions about your perceptions of IEPs, parental involvement and about what you do with your students. Your responses are important to the study so that staff reflections in general are included in the study. Your responses will be used for this study only and will remain absolutely confidential.

Individual responses will not be reported. All information will be reported by group only.

PART I

These first questions are about the special education program in general. You may or may not have opinions for some of the following questions. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to the questions. All we want is your best impression.

[3] 1. In general, how would you rate the usefulness of IEPs in working with your students? (READ RESPONSE OPTIONS)

( ) Very Useful (1) ( ) Somewhat Useful (2) ( ) Not very useful (3)

2. What information (if any) from IEPs have you used in the past as you've worked with students?

(PROBE)_____

_____

_____

_____

3. What, if anything, should be added to IEPs that would help you do a better job with your students?

(PROBE)_____

_____

_____

4. What suggestions (if any) do you have for improving the recordkeeping process for special education students?

(PROBE)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[4] 5. Is the IEP best suited for some particular types of students?

( ) Yes (1) ( ) No (2)

6. (DELETE IF ANSWER TO #5 IS "NO".) For what particular types of students is the IEP best?

(PROBE)_____

_____

_____

_____

[5] 7. In your opinion, is the time spent on the IEP worth the effort?

( ) Yes (1) ( ) No (2)

8. (DELETE IF ANSWER TO #7 IS "YES".) What could make the IEP a more worthwhile process and document?

(PROBE)_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

[6] 9. Does the IEP process provide enough opportunity for input from most regular classroom teachers?

( ) too much opportunity is provided (1)
( ) adequate opportunity is provided (2)
( ) not enough opportunity is provided (3)

[7] 10. In general, how much substantive input do most regular teachers contribute to the IEP?

( ) A great deal (1) ( ) Some (2) ( ) Not much (3)

These next questions are about kinds of activities and approaches you use in your special education classes.

[8] 11. Please select one letter from this card which best describes your use of published vs. teacher-made instructional materials. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD A). Read the letter to me.

( ) A (1) ( ) B (2) ( ) C (3) ( ) D (4) ( ) E (5)

[9-14] 12. Here is a list of ways to evaluate student performance as the year progresses. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD B). Please rank them from what you use most to what you use least. Which one do you use most often? Next? (KEEP GOING)

( ) A (1) ( ) B (2) ( ) C (3) ( ) D (4) ( ) E (5)
( ) F (6) Other: _____
(Write response, if any)

[15] 13. When you make your initial judgment about a student assigned to your class, do you use any of the following sources of information? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD C) Answer "yes" or "no".

( ) Yes (1) ( ) No (2)

[16-25] 14. (DELETE IF RESPONDENT ANSWERS "NO" TO QUESTION 13).

From this list, please select the five most important sources of information. Which is the most important source of information you use to make initial judgments of students? Next most important? (KEEP GOING UNTIL THEY HAVE RANKED FIVE)

( ) A (1) ( ) B (2) ( ) C (3) ( ) D (4) ( ) E (5)

( ) F (6) ( ) G (7) ( ) H (8) ( ) I (9) ( ) J (10)

( ) K (11) Other: _____

_____
(Write response if any)

[26] 15. How would you rate the amount of coordination between regular teachers and the special ed staff when delivering services to special ed students? (READ RESPONSE OPTIONS)

( ) A great deal (1) ( ) Some (2) ( ) Not much (3)

16. What, if anything, could be done to improve the coordination between regular and special ed teachers?

(PROBE)_____

_____

_____

_____

[27] 17a. In general, how much interaction is there between most resource special ed students and regular students in school?

( ) A great deal (1) ( ) Some (2) ( ) Not much (3)

[28] b. In general, how much interaction is there between most special ed students in self contained classes and regular students in school?

( ) A great deal (1) ( ) Some (2) ( ) Not much (3)

18. Let's define an academic approach as drill, reinforcement of concepts, and mastery of subject matter. Let's define a behavioral approach as helping students adjust socially, giving students feedback about behavior, helping students get along with teachers.

[29] Please select one letter from this card that best describes your approach. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD D)

( ) A (1) ( ) B (2) ( ) C (3) ( ) D (4) ( ) E (5)

These next questions are about parental involvement in Skokie's special education program.

[30] 19. In general, how much opportunity does the IEP process provide for parental input?

( ) A great deal (1) ( ) Some (2) ( ) Not much (3)

[31] 20. In general, how helpful is most parental input in the construction of the IEP? (READ RESPONSE OPTIONS)

( ) Very helpful (1) ( ) Somewhat helpful (2) ( ) Not helpful (3)

[32] 21. Now please think back to the IEP meetings in which you have participated during the past year. Can you remember any instance(s) of an IEP being changed because of parental input?

( ) Yes (1) ( ) No (2)

22. If you can remember such a change, please elaborate. (DELETE IF RESPONSE TO #21 IS "NO".)

_____

_____

_____

[33-34] 23. For what percentage of your special ed students do you have more than the required parental contact? (Required parental contact is 3 regularly scheduled meetings - 2 parent conferences and 1 IEP annual review meeting.)

_____%

[35] 24. When more than the three required conferences are necessary, what form of communication do you usually choose?

( ) Phone (1) ( ) Meeting at school (2) ( ) Written communication (3)

[36] 25. In your opinion, is more regularly scheduled time to personally communicate with parents important to improved student performance?

( ) Yes (1) ( ) No (2)

26. In order to see if parent involvement has anything to do with goal achievement, we'd like to know the names of parents who have contributed goals to the IEP. Could you tell me their names please? This will be confidential.

_____ _____

_____ _____

INSERT QUESTIONS ABOUT INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS HERE, IF NECESSARY.

SUGGESTED CONCLUSION: Thanks, we will let you know about the results of our study.

TIME INTERVIEW ENDED: _____

INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM (IEP) CHECKLIST

1981-82

Student Code: _____ School: _____

Grade of Student: _____

Please put a check in one column for each question.

Process Questions	Yes	No	Questionable
1. Has the IEP been reviewed within the last calendar year? (Is there an annual review?)	___	___	___
2. Were the following people represented at the meeting?			
a) special ed. staff person	___	___	___
b) regular teacher	___	___	___
c) parent/guardian	___	___	___
d) evaluation staff	___	___	___
3. Does the IEP indicate child's initial placement?	___	___	___
Content Questions			
4. Does the IEP state child's:			
a) present level of academic performance?	___	___	___
b) present level of behavioral performance?	___	___	___
c) degree of participation in regular classes?	___	___	___
d) placement with general definition of kinds of classes child will attend?	___	___	___
5. Does the IEP include annual goals (broad)?	___	___	___
6. Does the IEP have short term (instructional) objectives (STO's)?	___	___	___
Are the STO's:			
a) related to the goal?	___	___	___
b) logically and cumulatively sequenced?	___	___	___
c) measurable?	___	___	___
7. Does the IEP include evaluation measures for each STO?	___	___	___
a) are the evaluation measures repeatable?	___	___	___
b) was the evaluation done?	___	___	___

"END OF DOCUMENT"